

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/18/2000 09/663,989 Robert Charles Susil 55106 (71699) 4542 21874 02/07/2005 **EXAMINER** EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP JUNG, WILLIAM C P.O. BOX 55874 **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER BOSTON, MA 02205 3737

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	6
	09/663,989	SUSIL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William Jung	3737	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 2 months from the mailing date	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the fee to the fee to the control of the con	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amount should be shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · · ———		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment ·
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-44</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	.	
10. Other:			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding Claims 8, 9, 35, 36, 43, and 44, the rejection of 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 112 1st Paragraph is valid since the claims do not limit the orientation where the N shape motifs are within a coplane, however, the planes of each of N shape motifs are orthogonal to each other. This limitation is clearly not stated in claims 8, 9, 35, 36, 43, and 44. Therefore, the broadest interpretation of the claim is not supported by the non-coplanar arrangement of three fiducial markers asserted utility. Rgarding claims 1-44 are rejected with prior arts Kalfas et al and Gillies et al. Kalfas et al clearly anticipates the tracking of surgical instrument 42 with reference coordinates or reference frames determined from fiducial markers. In order for the markers to provide the reference frame the markers are inherently within the imaging field of view. And Gillieset al disclose a stereotactical deivice where a surgical instrument is used with CT or alternative image guidance system to locate the target and the surgical instrument to deliver drug or therapeutic compound.

BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700